



RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAR 18 2008

Residence Inn by Marriott Alexandria-Old Town
1456 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone: (703) 548-5474 Fax: (703) 684-6818

To: Examiner Serrao

From: Greg Lust

Fax: 571-273-8300

Date: 3/18/08

of pages including cover page: 4

Message: For tomorrow's interview.

Fax Charges:

Receive-----\$.10/page

Send-----\$1.00/page

International-----\$10.00/1st page, \$2.00 each additional page

Marriott Confidential and Proprietary Information - This communication contains information from Marriott International, Inc. that may be confidential. Except for personal use by the intended recipient, or as expressly authorized by the sender, any person who receives this information is prohibited from disclosing, copying, distributing, and/or using it. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately delete it and all copies, and promptly notify the sender. Nothing in this communication is intended to operate as an electronic signature under applicable law.

2/ 4
RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAR 18 2008

PROPOSED AMENDMENT
DO NOT ENTER IN THE RECORD

SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING TRANSPARENT ACCESS TO
DISTRIBUTED AUTHORIZING AND VERSIONING FILES INCLUDING
ENCRYPTED FILES

Serial No.: 10/052,039

Attorney Docket No.: 13768.783.91

Examiner Ranodhi N. Serrao

Interview March 19, 2008 at 2:00pm

1. (Currently Amended) In a computer network, a method of automatically and transparently handling WebDAV server and file access requests, the method comprising:

maintaining at an I/O manager a predetermined, stored a-priority order that indicates which of a plurality of redirectors has precedence to handle a WebDAV I/O request ~~in the event that two or more~~ when a plurality of suitably configured redirectors responds to a WebDAV I/O request, each redirector being equally capable of redirecting the received WebDAV ~~indicating a configuration suitable for handling the I/O request~~;

receiving at the I/O manager a WebDAV I/O request initiated from an application program, wherein the request indicates a path and filename of a remote file accessible via WebDAV;

polling available redirectors to determine which redirectors are configured to handle the application program's WebDAV I/O file request, each redirector suitably configured to handle the I/O request including appropriate functionality for receiving and redirecting WebDAV file requests to corresponding WebDAV server computer systems that store the remote files;

receiving responses from a plurality of suitably configured redirectors, each suitably configured redirector being equally capable of redirecting the received WebDAV I/O file request;

determining from the stored priority order which of the plurality of suitably configured redirectors has precedence to handle the WebDAV I/O request;

based on the determination, requesting a local file system of the redirector determined to have precedence to create the file in response to the WebDAV I/O request, downloading the file to a local cache of the redirector's file system, and

CONFIDENTIAL---DO NOT ENTER IN THE RECORD

PROPOSED AMENDMENT
DO NOT ENTER IN THE RECORD

returning a file handle corresponding to the file in the local cache to the application program;

providing access to the file in the local cache of the file system via the file handle; and

receiving a request to close the file via the file handle, and when received, uploading the file from the local cache of the file system to the WebDAV server.

New Claims:

42. (New) The method of claim 1, wherein the priority order is based on server type.

43. (New) The method of claim 42, wherein a different priority order is stored for each server type.

44. (New) The method of claim 1, further comprising:
determining that the redirector determined to have precedence is configured to handle all similar WebDAV I/O requests to a network share; and
bypassing any redirector polling for subsequent requests directed to the network share.

NOTE #1: To simplify the discussion during the interview, only previously amended claim 1 is reflected above. However, claims 16 and 33, which generally correspond to the method of claim 1, will also have corresponding amendments made thereto. We also wish to discuss proposed new claims 42-44.

NOTE #2: With regard to the substantive rejection of record for claim 1, it is believed that the amended independent claims are distinguished from the cited references for at least these reasons:

- *Serlet* describes a system and method by which computer users can seamlessly access remote files using any application with a well-known protocol (Col. 2:51-54). *Serlet* describes a seamless files system (SFS) that allows access to remote files, including WebDAV files, in the same manner as accessing local files without requiring any changes to the program's method of communication with the file system (Col. 2:54-59). SFS is an operating system (OS) extension that forwards remote file requests to a network access program (NAP). The NAP reformats the request to a common protocol (Col.

CONFIDENTIAL--DO NOT ENTER IN THE RECORD

PROPOSED AMENDMENT
DO NOT ENTER IN THE RECORD

2:60-67). The remote file system may be cached in the local file system, after which the two file systems are synchronized (Col. 3:10-16). *Serlet* is silent on maintaining a predetermined priority order that indicates which of a plurality of redirectors has precedence to handle a WebDAV I/O request when a plurality of suitably configured redirectors responds to the WebDAV I/O request.

- *Oehrke* describes a method of providing near 100% availability of services by using redirectors to direct network traffic to two or more application processors that provide the same service (Col. 2:61-65). When an application processor is unavailable, the system performs load balancing between the available processors. The redirectors may also be programmed to collect various network management statistics from the application processors to determine the most responsive processor for receiving network traffic (Col. 3:1-4). Using the collected (i.e. polled) statistics, the redirectors can shape the traffic (by changing packet destination addresses) going to each processor to balance the network load (Col. 5:19-24).
- The statistics may include simple network management protocol (SNMP) management information base (MIB) information such as I/O contention, processor/memory utilization, port availability, hop count, round trip speed, data rate, and other information. Weights are applied to the data adding or removing emphasis from some of the collected information. Based on this information, redirectors choose which application processors should receive the network traffic including user requests (Col. 5:54-Col. 6:6, and Col. 8:29-Col. 9:2). The selected redirector is the "potentially most responsive local redirector" based on the combined weighting. Thus, in a system with multiple redirectors providing the same services, the redirector with the highest weighting is chosen, or in other words, the redirector with the lowest processor utilization, highest port availability, lowest hop count, fastest data rate, etc. *Oehrke* does not choose from a plurality of redirectors, where each redirector is equally capable of redirecting a received WebDAV I/O request, based on a predetermined priority order. *Oehrke* makes determinations as to which application processor should process the request based on weighted statistics gathered by the redirectors, not based on a stored priority order. Thus, none of the art teaches claim 1 as amended.

CONFIDENTIAL--DO NOT ENTER IN THE RECORD